



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/780,041   | 02/09/2001  | Ronald Klein         | UF-10293            | 8442             |
| 29847  | 7590        | 03/19/2004           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| BEUSSE BROWNLEE WOLTER MORA & MAIRE<br>390 N. ORANGE AVENUE<br>SUITE 2500<br>ORLANDO, FL 32801 |             |                      | FALK, ANNE MARIE    |                  |
|  |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |             |                      | 1632                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/780,041

Applicant(s)

KLEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1632

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 23-38.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Anne-Marie Falk*  
Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1632

Art Unit: 1632

**Continuation of 2. NOTE:**

If entered, the proposed amendment would necessitate a new ground of rejection. In the proposed amendment, Claim 25 is amended so that it is directed to "[t]he composition of claim 23". Thus, a new ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, would be required since Claim 23 is directed to a method, not a composition.

**Continuation of 5.** The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

See above.

The objection to the drawings has not been addressed.

The objection to Claim 32 for including non-elected subject matter has not been addressed.

Although the proposed amended claims have been narrowed so that they are directed to (i) a method for producing a rat or mouse model of a neurodegenerative disease, (ii) a method for inducing behavioral changes in a rat or mouse, and (iii) a composition comprising at least one gene construct adapted for use in a rat or mouse, the claims remain broader than the indicated scope of enablement. See pages 5-6 of the Office Action mailed 11/19/03 which sets forth an appropriate scope of enablement and the reasoning set forth at pages 5-10 of the same Office Action.

Thus, even if the proposed amendments were entered, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failure to provide an enabling disclosure over the full scope, would be maintained for reasons of record.

Applicants arguments have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the fact that the arguments are directed to the claims as amended, but the amendments have not been entered for the reasons set forth herein above.

As the proposed amendments have not been entered, the claims remain rejected for reasons of record.